

Joseph Swift

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2026 15:47
To: Joseph Swift
Subject: Application No. DM/26/1186

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madam,
Re: Planning Application – Land West of Selsfield Road, Ardingly

I am writing to formally object to the proposed residential development on land west of Selsfield Road, Ardingly.

I strongly believe this proposal represents unsustainable development and would have an unacceptable impact on the village's infrastructure, environment, highway safety, and rural character.

My principal concerns are as follows:

Lack of Infrastructure

Ardingly does not have the infrastructure to support a development of this scale. The village has only one small convenience shop, limited local services, inadequate public transport, and no secondary school. Residents already rely heavily on travelling outside the village for shopping, education, healthcare and employment. Approving further housing without significant improvements to infrastructure would place additional strain on existing services and increase dependence on private vehicles, contrary to the principles of sustainable development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Water Supply

There are serious concerns about whether the existing water infrastructure has sufficient capacity to serve a significant increase in housing. Water resources are already under pressure, and it is essential that there is clear evidence that the local network can accommodate additional demand without affecting existing residents or the environment. Development should not proceed until adequate utility infrastructure is demonstrably available.

Traffic, Parking and Highway Safety

Traffic through Ardingly, particularly along the High Street, has become increasingly congested. The narrow roads are already under considerable pressure, and additional housing will inevitably generate more vehicle movements, worsening congestion and increasing road safety risks.

Parking within the village is already limited, and there is little capacity to absorb additional demand. Overspill parking would further obstruct roads and reduce safety for pedestrians, cyclists and emergency vehicles.

A particular concern is the volume of heavy goods vehicles travelling through the village from Heidelberg Materials. These large lorries regularly pass through Ardingly throughout the day, creating congestion and, in my experience, frequently travelling at excessive speeds. The combination of increased residential traffic with existing heavy commercial traffic would create an unacceptable highway safety risk.

The NPPF expects developments to provide safe and suitable access for all users and advises that developments should not be approved where the cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. I do not believe this proposal meets those expectations.

Loss of Countryside and Biodiversity

The proposed development would result in the loss of valuable countryside that contributes significantly to Ardingly's rural setting. This land provides habitat for wildlife and forms part of the landscape that defines the village. Once lost to development, these natural assets cannot be replaced.

The NPPF places great importance on protecting and enhancing the natural environment, securing measurable improvements for biodiversity where possible, and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. This proposal would undermine those objectives and erode an important green space that contributes to the village's identity.

Loss of Village Character

One of Ardingly's defining qualities is its attractive rural setting and strong village identity. I chose to live here because of its peaceful village atmosphere and surrounding countryside. A development of this scale would fundamentally alter the character of the village, replacing open countryside with suburban housing and eroding the qualities that make Ardingly a desirable and distinctive place to live.

I am also concerned that this proposal conflicts with the aims of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan, which seek to ensure that development is appropriate to the scale of the settlement, supported by adequate infrastructure, and respectful of the village's character and landscape setting.

Planning decisions should protect the identity of rural settlements and ensure that new development is proportionate to the capacity of local communities and infrastructure.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that the Local Planning Authority refuses this application. The proposal would place unacceptable pressure on local infrastructure, worsen existing traffic and parking problems, increase highway safety risks, fail to demonstrate adequate water capacity, harm biodiversity and the countryside, and permanently damage the unique rural character of Ardingly.

I respectfully ask the Council to give full weight to the National Planning Policy Framework, the Mid Sussex District Plan and the Ardingly Neighbourhood Plan when determining this application. In my view, this proposal is neither sustainable nor appropriate for a village with such limited infrastructure and services.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my objections.

Yours faithfully,